1. Greetings & Introductions
   a. The meeting began at 2:33PM with those present introducing themselves.
   b. Dr. Hong reviewed the structure of the committee and reaffirmed commitment to quorum
      among student representatives.
   c. Quorum being achieved the meeting proceeded as follows.

2. Approval of draft minutes from February 22, 2019
   a. The minutes of the meeting of February 22, 2019 were approved and adopted as presented.
      Motion by: Teddy Albiniak; 2nd by: Elizabeth Gandara

3. Review of recommendations from IRA Advisory Board
   a. Interim Associate Dean of Students Brian Stuart appeared on behalf Associate Vice President for
      Student Life & Dean of Students Dr. Danny Glassmann.
   b. Dr. Hong provided an overview of the IRA review process as prescribed by Executive Order #1102
      (updated via memo dated March 23rd).
   c. Jay Orendorff inquired as to the source of the IRA base funding for the year ($327,440). VP Hong
      explained that this is the amount of funds presented to the VPSAEM Office for disbursement but
      does not include all IRA fees that are collected (e.g., IRA fees that go to the Library). It was also
      noted that last year Associated Students asked for more transparency around these funds but
      this has not been granted to date.
   d. The SFAC asks that an appeal process for those denied IRA funds be developed and submitted for
      approval.
   e. Jay Orendorff asked that for the next funding cycle, prior year expenditure of IRA funds be added
      to the summary of recommendations provided by the Advisory Board. It was noted that the
      Advisory Board is already considering this as a part of other updates to the IRA funding request
      process for entities previously awarded funds.
   f. Stephren Ragler noted with concern, and with concurrence from other students in attendance, a
      disparity in IRA fund allocations between the College of Ethnic Studies and the College of Liberal
      & Creative Arts. VP Hong responded to this concern by pointing out that the sizes of two colleges,
      in terms of FTEs and the number of academic departments, also varies widely and could account
      for the disparity.
g. Efforts will be made to increase awareness of and access to funding for programs/departments new to the IRA funding process.

h. Brian Stuart raised the question: is IRA funding available for student organizations, i.e. Gospel Gators? In response it was explained that co-curricular organizations/activities associated with instruction are eligible to apply for IRA funding. Committee members cited other co-curricular organizations that also receive IRA support (S.K.I.N.S.; Moot Court).

i. VP Hong, along with various others, praised the IRA Advisory Board for their very cautious and thoughtful handling of IRA funding requests.

j. A motion to endorse the IRA Advisory Board’s recommendations was made by Teddy Albiniak; 2nd by Elizabeth Gandara. The motion carried with one abstention (Jay Orendorff).

4. Update from Campus Recreation
   a. Pam Su, Director, Campus Recreation and Francisco Lazo, Campus Recreation Representative, A.S. Board of Directors presented the 2019-20 proposed budget for Campus Recreation. Details of the proposed budget as presented to the SFAC are attached. Noted from the discussion on this presentation:
   b. Budget planning for 2019-20 began in February and was vetted by the Mashouf Wellness Center (MWC) Advisory Council.
   c. The Wellness Center summer fee on slide #2 of the attached was corrected to $77.
   d. It was explained that facility rental revenue (slide #2) includes West Campus Green and tennis court rentals.
   e. Debt Service Payment (slide #3) refers to payments on the bonds for the construction of the MWC.
   f. Student & Casual Worker positions salary increase reflects a pay rate range change. The new range is the MWC effort to honor a resolution of the Academic Senate in support of meeting the San Francisco City and County minimum wage vs the state of California minimum.
   g. Salaries of Campus Recreation full-time staff are collectively bargained (CSUEU) and Campus Recreation must absorb increases mandated by the CBA.
   h. Dr. Hong noted, as a point of clarification, that Associated Students’ practice of matching collectively bargained salary increases is voluntary.
   i. Following the presentation there was a question and answer period – there were none.

5. Request for Student Health Fee increase effective Fall 2020
   a. Presented by: Eugene Chelberg, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs; Roger Elrod, Director, Student Health Services; Karen Boyd, Director, Health Promotion & Wellness; Ezekiel Nwaigwe, Student Representative, Student Health Advisory Committee.
   b. The detailed presentation is attached. No action was taken on this request.
   c. A robust discussion, along with the need to adjust several monetary figures in the presentation, generated sufficient concern as to merit augmentation/revision of the request as presented. Points of the discussion included:
   d. Operating at a ratio of 1:2000, SF State stands far below the IACS suggested counselor to student ration which is 1:1500. The campus is working to increase the number of mental health service providers available for students.
   e. The Health Promotion & Wellness unit pulls together services formerly disbursed between various units. Mr. Elrod pointed out that the SHC faces a $1.3 million shortfall which is now being covered by reserves. However, these reserves are not sufficient to sustain current expenses beyond the next three years.
f. In response to a question from Jay Orendorff, Mr. Chelberg pointed out that the revenue from the sources such as the pharmacy and the Family PACT program (misc. revenue) are helping to cover the shortfall, but that these sources are not generating the amount of revenue that they once provided. If passed, California state proposition 63 funds would be a welcomed and helpful addition to the SHC revenue stream, as they could go to support counselors.

g. In lieu of a referendum, Student Health Services and Health Promotion & Wellness engaged in alternative consultation methods, as authorized by President Wong, in seeking this requested increase to the Student Health Fee. Alternative methods included a student survey and focus groups.

h. Ezekiel Nwaigwe addressed the committee regarding the student feedback garnered from these alternative consultation methods. The services currently available provides access to services that students would not have otherwise. Mr. Nwaigwe highlighted, from a student perspective, the vital need to secure these services for the future.

i. Mr. Chelberg noted that the CSU system does not accept student’s medical insurance (if they have this with their families) because over time these dollars “don’t pencil out”, and the issue is further complicated because insurance coverage and costs would be tied to a student’s home county because insurance coverage does not operate from a centralized system.

j. The presenters advised the committee that if this increase model is adopted, the Student Health Services would not need to turn to the SFAC again for several years.

k. Students in attendance highlighted the concern and frustration of many SF State students that services being provided are not comprehensive. Specifically cited were the lack of specialists at the SHC and the mental health counselor to student ratio.

l. It was suggested that the presenters draft an action memo which reflects the actual out of pocket costs to students, and the impact of the requested increase on student financial aid awards. It was further suggested that they work with the office of Student Financial Aid to address the gap between need and actual costs to learn what financial aid can off-set.

m. Student Chantel Bermudez shared concerns regarding the lack of people of color and queer counselors. Students want to be assured that the university will follow through and provide the services promised, noting that there is some history on the campus of promises not coming to fruition.

n. Karen Boyce responded that student representation on hiring committees is one way to help facilitate the recruitment of people of color and queer service providers, and that efforts could be made in this regard going forward.

o. Mr. Chelberg pointed out that over time both priorities and student needs change, citing as an example that as recent as 2012 the subject of student basic needs was not on the radar. He affirmed their commitment to working with the SHAC based on the data that the campus now has as a result of the alternative consultation engaged this year.

p. Mia Veal requested that Student Health Services provide a breakdown of what specific services would be increased if their request were to be approved, as would have been the case if the referendum process had been used.

q. In addressing the choice not to put this fee increase request to a referendum vote, it was explained that per CSU policy, new fees require a referendum, and a change to an existing fee does not have to go through a referendum. Student Health Services relied heavily on the alternative consultation models previously described. Roger Elrod and Karen Boyd commented that the alternative consultation methods were more effective than a referendum vote in the terms of the tangible feedback SHS received. The need and desire for dental services and providing nap cots are two specific take aways from the alternative consultation, for example, that would be hard to garner from a vote.
r. Elizabeth Gandara, along with the other students who were present, commented that outreach to students, such as the alternative consultation models, should be ongoing throughout the school year and not only when there is a desire to increase a fee.

s. The use of contract services to provide some urgent need services was discussed. Specifically a company called Protocol was discussed. Students expressed concern that a national service for telephone assistance for urgent mental health needs may not be effective for our diverse student population in terms of helping queer people and people of color.

t. Gene Chelberg responded to this concern by advising that Protocol operators’ training is trauma informed for immediate triage, but that he would research their training/response regarding queer people and people of color.

u. How to move forward for a potential fall 2020 implementation of the requested increase was discussed. Lee Lockhart suggested that an annual review with SFAC measuring service standards against the ISAC index would be beneficial. The challenge noted with such a review would be the campus February 1st deadline and the release of the index.

v. The SFAC co-chairs reminded the group that a vote of this committee is a recommendation to the campus president. SFAC can reconvene as late as June 30th to take such a vote.

w. The calendar will be reviewed to identify another meeting opportunity before that date, during which time augmentation to the proposal should be made in consultation with the Student Health Advisory Committee.

6. Miscellaneous Course Fee Requests

a. Dr. Hong noted for the Committee that time does not permit the committee to address the final agenda item of Category III fees

b. She further noted that due to delays within the University administration the Category III fee action requests were submitted late. These may be addressed at the next SFAC meeting. The meeting adjourned at 4:13pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Sharber, Office & Events Coordinator
Office of the Vice President & Title IX Coordinator

Endorsed May 9, 2019